

REMARKS

Claims 1 - 3, 5 - 12, and 14 - 18 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Cass et al. Cass et al. disclose a binary coding system in which two different colors are used to print binary digital data as color patches on a surface, such as a sheet of paper. Cass et al. also suggests that this concept can be extended from a binary coding system to an N-ary system by using more than two colors (col. 5, lines 29 - 36 of Cass et al.).

In response, claim 1 has been amended to incorporate the limitations of dependent claims 5 and 6 requiring a control line between adjacent regions in the two-dimensional array. Claims 5 and 6 are redundant in light of these amendments to claim 1, and therefore have been canceled. The dependency of claim 7 has been changed accordingly. A typographical error has also been corrected in claim 7. Similarly amendments have been made to independent claim 8 to incorporate the limitations of dependent claims 11 and 12, and to independent claim 14 to incorporate the limitations of dependent claims 17 and 18. Dependent claims 11, 12, 17 and 18 have been canceled in light of these amendments.

Applicant submits that nothing in Cass et al. teaches or suggests the use of control lines to separate and delineate different regions of the printed two-dimensional array. This feature can be used to help maintain registration during scanning, and thereby enhances accuracy and allows greater printing densities.

The Office Action cites column 3, lines 40 - 47, of Cass et al. as disclosing such control lines. However, the cited portion of Cass et al. merely states that the color patches are printed along a single axis. Nothing in the Cass et al. teaches or suggest control lines between adjacent regions.

Claims 4, 13 and 19 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Cass et al. in view of Gormish et al. Gormish et al have been cited to show that data compression is old. In response, Applicant respectfully submits that each of these are dependent claims, and that the invention defined in each of these

dependent claims should be considered as a whole. The specific elements provided by each of these dependent claims should be considered in combination with the elements of their respective independent claims, rather than as isolated elements by themselves.

Favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

DORR, CARSON, SLOAN, BIRNEY & KRAMER, P.C.

Date: 6/22/05

By: Thomas S. Birney
Thomas S. Birney #30,025
3010 East 6th Avenue
Denver, Colorado 80206
(303) 333-3010

Attorneys for Applicant